

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 were pending in the subject application. Applicants have added new claims 32-34.

Support for new claim 32 may be found *inter alia* on page 10, paragraphs [0085]-[0086] of the U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0225004.

Support for new claim 33 may be found *inter alia* on page 6, paragraph [0049] of the U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0225004.

Support for new claim 34 may be found *inter alia* on page 6, paragraph [0050] of the U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0225004.

Applicants believe that no new matter is added by the amendments and the new claims.

After entry of this amendment, claims 1-34 will be pending.

I. ELECTION/RESTRICTIONS

In the May 4, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner required restriction of the claims to one of the following groups drawn to allegedly distinct inventions:

Group I Claims 1-19, drawn to a method of treating papillomavirus related epithelial disorder comprising administering a iron/zinc chelators and one cruciferous indoles, classified in class 514, subclass 415; and

Group II Claims 20-31, drawn to a composition comprising an iron/zinc chelators and one cruciferous indoles, classified in class 514, subclass 415.

The Examiner contends that the above inventions are distinct each from the other.

In response, Applicants provisionally elect with traverse Group II, claims 20-31, drawn to compositions comprising an iron/zinc chelators and one cruciferous indoles. .

Applicants traverse the election among Groups I-II. Applicants submit that search and examination of these two Groups would not impose a serious burden on the Examiner. The M.P.E.P. § 803 (Eighth Edition, Revision 5, August 2006) states:

If the search and examination of all the claims in an application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine them on the merits, even though they include claims to independent or distinct inventions.

Upon the allowance of a product claim, Applicants request that any non-elected process claim that require all the limitations of the allowable product claim be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of M.P.E.P. § 821.04.

Applicants reserve the right to prosecute the non-elected subject matter in one or more related applications.

II. SPECIES ELECTION

On page 2 of the May 4, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner further required that the Applicants elect a single disclosed species of (A) the chelators and (B) the cruciferous indoles, for examination purposes.

In response, Applicants hereby provisionally elect with traverse (A) sodium butyrate as a species of chelator and (B) Diindolylmethane (DIM) as a species of cruciferous indole. The claims in Group II that are readable upon the elected species are 20-34. Claims 20-34 are generic.

Applicants traverse the election amongst the aforementioned species. Search and examination of these species would not impose a serious burden on the Examiner. See M.P.E.P. § 803.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, Applicants request that claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable generic claim be considered pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.141.

CONCLUSION

Applicants reserve the right to petition from the restriction requirement under 37 C.F.R. § 1.144. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute the non-elected subject matter in one or more related applications.

Applicants respectfully request that the above amendments and remarks be entered and made of record in the file history of the instant application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 1, 2007


Thomas E. Friebel 29,258
JONES DAY
222 East 41st Street
New York, New York 10017
(212) 326-3939
Reg. No.